

Claim 1 has been amended and it should be clearly understood now.

The examiner states that "McConnell teaches a system for duplicating keys including a basic key reader 14 and a sliding bar reader 32 for touching and determining the location, depths and spaces of wafers within the lock". This is correct. The examiner further states that "there is a reading of information at 80, 82 in an opening in the head 16 of the reader". This is not correct. The opening 30 in McConnell is not in the head of the reader but is designated as being a groove in the sliding bar. This then is different in McConnell. Therefore, McConnell cannot constitute a base reference that could further be modified by a secondary reference under 35 U.S.C. 103 such as Easley. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McConnell in view of Herzenberg. As best understood.

Claim 2 has been amended and should be understood now.

The line 51 in column 5 does not agree with what is being claimed. For example, in Herzenberg, a color on a tab 36 matches the color on a location of the card 80. Applicant is claiming "a knob on a sliding bar at an outer end thereof and said color matches the color of the basic key reader." This is not taught by Herzenberg and, therefore, the reference cannot be used to modify McConnell to arrive at what is claimed.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(b) as being unpatentable over McConnell in view Naill and Heridia. As best as understood.

Claim 3 has been amended and should now be understood.

All three references singly or combined do not teach a basic key reader that is inserted into a cylindrical lock including a sliding bar reader that is inserted into the basic key reader. The sliding bar reader touched any of the wafers to determine a location a depth and the space of each of the wafers as is now claimed. McConnell has been discussed above and found not to qualify as a base reference.

Therefore, the second and third reference used in rejecting the claim 3 does not augment of what is being claimed. It is agreed that Naill teaches recording information but not by reading a slide bar reader, as is claimed, but by making a record of the positions of certain levers. This altogether different from applicant's claim. Heredia, while recording information on cards, cannot cure the above identified defect.

In view of all of the above, it is believed that applicant has paid attention to all objections and rejections and has made amendments and corrections accordingly and the examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the objections and rejections made in the office action and pass this application to an early indication of allowance.

X 

Steven G. Mathena

Date: X 12-16-05